

REMARKS

In the aforementioned Office communication, the examiner correctly rejected claim 11 under Section 112 as being indefinite as there was no antecedent basis for the phrase "the pair of carriers." That phrase has been changed to reflect only the single term "carrier" and this is felt to overcome the rejection under Section 112.

Claims 7-9 and 11 were rejected under Section 102 as being anticipated by the patent to Hutchison while claim 7 was further rejected under Section 103 as being unpatentable over Neumann et al., claim 9 was rejected under Section 103 as being unpatentable over Neumann et al. in view of Ritter, and claim 11 was rejected under Section 103 as being unpatentable over Neumann et al. It should be noted claim 7 is the only independent claim remaining in the application and it has been amended herein to be patentably distinct from all the prior art so that each of claims 7-9 and 11 are now felt to be allowable.


Independent claim 7 has been amended to state the first and second flanges of the panels extend longitudinally over the upstanding free end of the carrier. This is evident in the present invention in Fig. 3. This relationship of the flanges to the free end of the carrier is not existent in any of the prior art, however, and there is certainly no suggestion in any of the prior art of overlying the upstanding free end of the carrier with both the first and second flanges of adjacent panels.

Accordingly, it is felt the claims as now amended are patentably distinguishable from the prior art and there being no other objections or rejections of the application, it is felt it is now in condition for allowance and such action is courteously requested.

Dated this 17 day of January 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Gary M. Polumbus", is written over a horizontal line.

Gary M. Polumbus, Reg. No. 25,364

USPTO Customer No. 20686

Tel: (303) 628-1500

Fax: (303) 629-3450

GMP/dtc